

REMARKS

The abstract has been amended as requested by the examiner.

Claims 8, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Larabell et al. (US 6,047,379). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larabell et al. (US 6,047,379) in view of Naito et al. (US 6,561,849 B2) and Bassler et al. (US 6,379,184 B1). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larabell et al. (US 6,047,379) in view of Boutros et al. (US 6,796,806 B2). Claims 10, 13, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larabell et al. (US 6,047,379) in view of Bassler et al. (US 6,379,184 B1). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claim 8 has been amended above to claim that the second connector part prevents substantive voltage from the power supply line from being carried by the cable to a third part. Support for this amendment can be found at page 4, lines 34 et seq. Larabell et al. is specifically designed to supply power to the device 90 via cable 80 (see column 5, lines 12-17). With applicant's invention, on the other hand, the power supply line is isolated from the wires 13 of the cable 14 to avoid the wires carrying a substantive voltage over the cable to the third part 16. Nowhere in Larabell et al. is there a disclosure or suggestion of not supplying device 80 with power via the cable 80. Such a configuration would appear to be contrary to the teaching of Larabell et al. which explicitly

requires the device 90 to receive power from the cable 80. With applicant's invention, the connector system is specifically configured to only supply power to the active electronic circuit in the second connector part and not to the cable. Thus, the cable is only a signal cable; not a power cable. The unique combination of a non-powered/signal cable and a connector part having a powered electronic circuit is not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. The features of claim 8 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, claim 8 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though the dependent claims contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 8. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Independent claims 12, 13 and 15 have been amended similar to claim 8. For the reasons stated with regard to claim 8, it is believed that claims 12, 13 and 15 should also be allowed.

Claims 16-17 have been added to claim the features recited therein.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Appl. No.: 10/523,903
Reply to Office Action of: 02/20/2007

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 4/17/07
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

4/17/2007
Date

Elaine F. Mason
Name of Person Making Deposit